

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 6-11 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112, first paragraph

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner note that the features of claim 6 of storing the security information on the security server and transmitting the security information and the document data to the receiving facsimile machine from the transmitting facsimile machine.

Regarding the feature of claim 1 of storing the security information on the security server, the second sentence of paragraph [0028] of specification discusses: "The security server 250 for facsimile machines having already stored security information including authorized users' IDs and passwords, updates the previously stored security information SECUR based on the security information SECUR received from the receiving facsimile machine 240." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the written description requirement for the feature of claim 6 of storing the security information on the security server is satisfied.

Regarding the feature of claim 6 of transmitting the security information and the document data to the receiving facsimile machine from the transmitting facsimile machine, the third sentence of paragraph [0027] of the specification discusses: "The document data DOC and the security information SECUR are transmitted from the transmitting facsimile machine 220 to the receiving facsimile machine 240." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the written description requirement for the feature of claim 6 of transmitting the security information and the document data to the receiving facsimile machine from the transmitting facsimile machine is satisfied.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112, second paragraph

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner did not understand the features of claim 6 of storing the security information on the security server and transmitting the security information and the document data to the receiving facsimile machine from the transmitting facsimile machine. As discussed

above, at least paragraphs [0027] and [0028] of the specification explain these features of the present invention as recited in claim 6.

The Examiner further noted that it was unclear if the security information in line 11 of claim 6 was the security information stored in the security server or the security information transmitted by the transmitting facsimile machine. Only one claim element security information is recited. In the specification it goes by the reference SECUR.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -- 103

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBry (US 6,385,728) (hereinafter "DeBry") in view of Stodder et al. (US 5,727,890) (hereinafter "Stodder").

Claims 6-11

Claim 6 recites: "...wherein the security information is transmitted via a security communication line different from a communication line that transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine."

The Office Action continues to rely on 9:66-10:5 of DeBry to show this feature of claim 6. This section of DeBry notes that: "In one embodiment, it should be noted that the secret key built into the printer and stored in the database of the authority is only used between the printer and the authority for generating digital certificates. In such an embodiment, the secret key is not used for any other communications using traditional symmetric cryptography." DeBry, 9:66-10:5.

As is well known, encryption is the process of transforming plaintext information using an algorithm or cipher to make it unreadable to anyone except those possessing a key. The result of the process is encrypted information that can be sent over a public line. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that just because DeBry discusses the use of a secret key, does not imply at all that the secret key is used in conjunction with a separate communication line.

More specifically, in DeBry, all of the communications 2, 3, 4 and 5 (including the encrypted will call certificate) appear to be through the same line or medium. By contrast, claim 6 recites that the security information is transmitted -- from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine -- via a security communication line different from a communication line that transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine. Further, this deficiency in DeBry is not cured by Stodder.

This technical feature of claim 6 allows for authorized users to be authenticated to print predetermined document data even when transmitting and receiving facsimile machines do not share the same manufacturer or the same protocol, which is a technical advantage not realized by the relied upon prior art.

Claims 7-11 depend on claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Nov 13, 2008

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501